

---

# Dual Process Learning: Controlling Use of In-Context vs. In-Weights Strategies with Weight Forgetting

---

Suraj Anand

Michael A. Lepori

Jack Merullo

Ellie Pavlick

Brown University  
Department of Computer Science  
Correspondence to suraj\_anand@brown.edu

## Abstract

Language models have the ability to perform in-context learning (ICL), allowing them to flexibly adapt their behavior based on context. This contrasts with in-weights learning, where information is statically encoded in model parameters from iterated observations of the data. Despite this apparent ability to learn in-context, language models are known to struggle when faced with unseen or rarely seen tokens. Hence, we study **structural in-context learning**, which we define as the ability of a model to execute in-context learning on arbitrary tokens – so called because the model must generalize on the basis of e.g. sentence structure or task structure, rather than semantic content encoded in token embeddings. An ideal model would be able to do both: flexibly deploy in-weights operations (in order to robustly accommodate ambiguous or unknown contexts using encoded semantic information) and structural in-context operations (in order to accommodate novel tokens). We study structural in-context algorithms in a simple part-of-speech setting using both practical and toy models. We find that active forgetting, a technique that was recently introduced to help models generalize to new languages, forces models to adopt structural in-context learning solutions. Finally, we introduce **temporary forgetting**, a straightforward extension of active forgetting that enables one to control how much a model relies on in-weights vs. in-context solutions. Importantly, temporary forgetting allows us to induce a *dual process strategy* where in-context and in-weights solutions coexist within a single model.<sup>1</sup>

## 1 Introduction

A distinguishing trait of transformers is their ability to perform ‘in-context’ learning (ICL) [Brown et al., 2020, Dong et al., 2023, Garg et al., 2023] – the ability to use context at inference time to adjust model behavior, without weight updates, to generalize to unseen input-output combinations. This ability enables the models to flexibly accommodate variations in language. For instance, a model is likely to memorize that the token *green* is typically an adjective, but recognize that it is used as a noun in the sentence *The child sat on the main green*. If queried to predict the part of speech (POS) of *green*, a model using the in-weights strategy would likely incorrectly predict *adjective*, while the in-context strategy would allow it to infer *noun*.

Recent research has studied the tradeoff between ICL and in-weights learning (IWL) in transformers [Chan et al., 2022b, Singh et al., 2023, Reddy, 2023, Chan et al., 2022a]. Chan et al. [2022b] found that language-like data distributional properties play a critical role in the emergence of ICL.

---

<sup>1</sup>We release code here for reproducibility




Figure 1: (Top Left) In our natural setting, we use a part-of-speech probe trained on BERT representations of sentences from Penn Treebank 3 and evaluate on templated examples (Section 2). (Top Right) In our synthetic setting, we train a small masked language model (MLM) on a grammar where the expected response is conditioned on the part-of-speech of the query (Section 3). (Bottom Left) An idealization of our main finding: structural ICL is transient (i.e. decays over training) in both natural and synthetic settings. Active/temporary forgetting maintains structural ICL in the synthetic setting. (Bottom Right) T-SNE visualization of token embeddings after standard vanilla MLM training on synthetic setting [van der Maaten and Hinton, 2008]. We see that embeddings in the head of the distribution cluster together, as do the unseen token embeddings. The embeddings in the tail of the distribution bridge between the two clusters. Models using conditional ICL would only generalize to the heldout examples that exist within the head token distribution. Models using structural ICL would freely generalize to all token embeddings.

Importantly, they found that ICL and IWL strategies often appear to be in opposition; only with a particular skew of the label distribution were they able to promote both strategies to co-occur in a model. With a similar setup, Singh et al. [2023] found that ICL strategies smoothly decrease in strength across distributions; furthermore, while they found regularization mitigates ICL transience, they never arrive at a method that allows ICL and IWL to permanently co-exist in the same model. An ideal model would encode *dual processes*: flexible, context-sensitive operations for out-of-distribution settings and memorized, static operations for ambiguous contexts or IID settings [Kahneman, 2011, Miller, 2000].

Moreover, prior work [Singh et al., 2023, Chan et al., 2022b] has focused on what we refer to as **conditional in-context learning**. That is, they focus on ICL which generalizes to heldout inputs which are imbued with semantic information, and thus can be seen as *interpolations* of seen inputs. Such conditional ICL algorithms would likely fail to predict that in the sentence *The child sat on the main bluk.*, the new word *bluk* is a noun. Conditional ICL algorithms fail when they include tokens that are undertrained [Land and Bartolo, 2024, Rumbelow and Watkins, 2023] or newly-introduced (e.g. when adding languages to an existing model) [Chen et al., 2024]. This breakdown in ICL performance occurs because the model is not encoding a truly content-independent in-context strategy, and rare and unseen embeddings are often out-of-distribution after vanilla training, as shown in Figure 1 (Bottom Right). In contrast, we define **structural in-context learning** to be the ability of a model to perform in-context learning on arbitrary tokens, or *extrapolations* from seen inputs. We test this by assessing performance on unseen tokens in a naturalistic and synthetic setting described in Figure 1 (Top Left, Top Right). While conditional ICL fails on the tail of highly-skewed distributions Chan et al. [2022b], structural ICL would maintain performance.

We find that structural ICL is *also* transient. However, while regularization provides a path to persistence in conditional ICL [Singh et al., 2023], it does not for structural ICL. Therefore, we propose an extension to active forgetting – a recent weight resetting technique introduced by Chen et al. [2024] to help augment models with new tokens – to make structural ICL persistent. Our modification allows us to coarsely control the strategies that the model adopts, enabling us to induce a dual process strategy: (structural) ICL for rare and unseen tokens and IWL for common tokens.

Our main contributions are:

- We define and study the concept of **structural ICL** in both large models and toy models using a simple part-of-speech probing task. This allows for true generalization of in-context strategies for completely unseen tokens. We discover that MLMs exhibit a (limited) form of structural in-context learning that emerges early in training, but that this ability quickly vanishes.
- We show active forgetting [Chen et al., 2024] maintains structural ICL in models. We introduce **temporary forgetting**, a straightforward extension of active forgetting that enables one to control how much a model relies on in-weights vs. in-context solutions.
- We demonstrate that when training with skewed token distributions, temporary forgetting enables us to induce a *dual process strategy* where our model uses an in-weights solution for frequently-seen tokens in the head of the distribution and a (structural) in-context solution for rare tokens in the tail.

## 2 (Structural) In-Context Learning is Transient

Recent work has discovered that conditional ICL capabilities slowly degrade in synthetic settings over the course of training [Singh et al., 2023]. Building on this work, we track the tradeoff of conditional IC vs. IW algorithms in a naturalistic syntax probing task over the course of training for encoder-only language models (LMs). More importantly, we also track structural ICL over the course of training. We study the MultiBERTs, averaging all of our results across seeds 0, 1, and 2. We calculate error bars in Figure 2 as  $\pm 1$  standard error of the mean (SEM).

### 2.1 Task

We design a task that employs templated stimuli to determine the tradeoffs between different strategies for assigning part of speech to tokens – this task permits both structural IC and IW solutions. For instance, in the sentence *the dog is happy*, there are at least two ways of determining that *dog* is a noun: (1) memorize that the token identity “dog” is a noun or (2) extract that *dog* is the subject of the sentence from the context. For each layer and MultiBERT step, we train a binary POS probe on representations of nouns and adjectives from sentences in the training set of Penn Treebank 3 (PTB-3) [Marcus et al., 1993]. For multi-token words, we average representations across tokens. See Appendix A.1 for additional details about our probing setup. We then evaluate the pretrained MultiBERT and probe on a suite of test sets designed to assess the adoption of in-context or in-weights strategies. Each dataset contains sentences that obey the template: The <noun> is <adj> (e.g. The dog is happy). Our evaluation datasets are defined as follows:

1. **Head:** Templated examples where tokens are sampled from the most frequent 1500 nouns and most frequent 1500 adjectives in the training set of PTB-3.
2. **Tail:** Templated examples where tokens are sampled from the least frequent 1500 nouns and most frequent 1500 adjectives in the training set of PTB-3.
3. **Head Switch:** Templated examples where tokens are sampled as in the “Head” dataset, but where nouns appear in the adjective position and adjectives appear in the noun position (e.g., *The happy is dog*).
4. **Tail Switch:** Defined similarly to “Head Switch”, except where the tokens are sampled from the tail of the token distribution.
5. **Unseen Token:** Templated examples where “nouns” and “adjectives” are sampled from a set of 1,500 randomly initialized tokens. This metric evaluates structural ICL performance<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup>We are able to generate novel labels not seen during train time because the embedding and unembedding matrices are tied in the MultiBERT models.




Figure 2: (Left) We exhibit the transience of structural ICL by examining the Unseen Token Accuracy over time. (Middle) We show the trend of memorization of tail versus head of distribution over training steps by examining the difference in Layer 7 Accuracy, where both in-context and in-weights strategies are possible, and Layer 0 Accuracy, where only an in-weights strategy is possible; (Right) We display the preference for in-weights strategy when conflicting with in-context strategy over time.

Note that the MultiBERTs are trained following Devlin et al. [2019] on a combination of BookCorpus [Zhu et al., 2015] and English Wikipedia collected by Turc et al. [2019]. As such, the distribution of the training data is fixed, and our experiments are constrained to the natural distribution of language. As BookCorpus does not have POS tags readily accessible, we employ PTB-3 to estimate the noun and adjective distribution of the training data. We defined nouns and adjectives as words that appeared as each POS, respectively, over 80% of the time. We chose 1500 examples as this is  $\approx 10\%$  of the number of unique nouns.

## 2.2 Training Dynamics

We examine (1) structural in-context learning and (2) the tradeoff between in-context and in-weight strategies over the course of training.

**Structural ICL** We find that the MultiBERTs are initially able to perform structural ICL, but that this capability is transient. In Figure 2 (Left), we present results from a probe trained on representations from Layer 7 as this layer achieves the highest probing validation performance on PTB-3. This is consistent with prior research which demonstrates that syntactic structures are encoded in the middle layers of MLMs Tenney et al. [2019], Limisiewicz and Mareček [2020]. Furthermore, results across all layers are presented in Appendix A.2. Structural ICL transience is evident as probe performance on Unseen Tokens tend to spike early in MultiBERT training before dropping to chance by the end of training. These results suggest that there is an inductive bias toward structural ICL that diminishes as information is encoded in the embeddings. As structural ICL confers the ability to generalize to rare and new tokens, this raises questions about how we can train models that maintain this ability throughout training.

**In-Context vs. In-Weights Strategies** Next, we compare conditional in-context vs. in-weights strategies for observed tokens. First, we observe that ICL strategies dissipate over training, as more information is encoded in token embeddings. We approximate the use of in-context information for determining POS as the difference in performance between Layer 0 (the embedding layer) and Layer 7. Layer 0 must rely only on in-weights information as there is no in-context information available; in contrast, Layer 7 uses contextualization to achieve higher performance [Tenney et al., 2019, Hewitt et al., 2021]. Early in training, this additional in-context information leads to higher probe accuracy; however, this benefit disappears over time. Figure 2 (Middle) demonstrates this trend across tokens at the head and tail of the distribution. Notably, the benefit of in-context information disappears more quickly for the head of the distribution than the tail, likely because there are far more gradient updates to head token embeddings.<sup>3</sup>

As the benefit of the model’s use of in-context information dissipates, we observe that the model shifts from an in-context to an in-weights strategy in Figure 2 (Right). Specifically, we find that a model’s preference toward assigning POS on the basis of token identity (i.e. an in-weights solution) increases slightly over time when in-context and in-weights information are in conflict. In other

<sup>3</sup>We observe that performance gain due to the model’s use of in-context information decreases across a wide range of syntactic phenomena as embeddings are enriched during training. We term this the "Pushdown Phenomenon" and explore it more thoroughly in Appendix A.4.

words, models become more reliant on in-weights strategies and less reliant on in-context strategies over the course of training. This finding aligns with Singh et al. [2023], which analyzed a similar phenomenon using toy models and a synthetic task. Additionally, we observe that the degree to which the model adopts an in-weights strategy varies significantly for tokens selected from the head versus the tail of the distribution. When assigning POS to tokens in the the head of the distribution, the model relies almost exclusively on an in-weights solution, while the model relies on both in-weights and in-context solutions when assigning POS to tokens in the tail.

In summary, we find that (1) the benefit of the model’s use of context information disappears over time and (2) reliance on in-weights information increases over time, varying depending on the distributional properties of the token that we are probing.

### 3 Synthetic Task: Distributional Parameters Impact In-Context Learning

We develop a synthetic masked language modeling task to reproduce the above trends, in order to characterize how distributional parameters affect the learning strategy that the model adopts. Our synthetic task requires the model to determine which of two classes a word belongs to. This may be derived either from in-context information or by memorizing token identity-class associations in the embedding layer. We draw analogies between these classes and POS in natural language.

Our vocabulary contains tokens that represent nouns, adjectives, and a copula (i.e. *is*). Each sentence is created by selecting (1) a sequence  $S$ , (2) a query  $Q$ , and (3) a response pattern  $P$ . Our MLM is trained to predict  $\mathbb{P}(P_i|S, Q)$  for all  $i \in \{0, \dots, |P| - 1\}$  (i.e. the probability of each pattern token). The sequence and pattern are arbitrary and designed so that no exceedingly simple heuristic may solve this task.

- sequence  $S$ : Either  $\langle \text{noun} \rangle \langle \text{copula} \rangle \langle \text{adj} \rangle$  or  $\langle \text{copula} \rangle \langle \text{adj} \rangle \langle \text{noun} \rangle$ .
- query  $Q$ : Either the  $\langle \text{noun} \rangle$  or  $\langle \text{adj} \rangle$  from the sequence.
- pattern  $P$ : Either  $\langle \text{adj} \rangle \langle \text{noun} \rangle \langle \text{noun} \rangle$  if the query is a  $\langle \text{noun} \rangle$  or  $\langle \text{adj} \rangle \langle \text{adj} \rangle \langle \text{adj} \rangle$  if the query is an  $\langle \text{adj} \rangle$ .

This task is designed such that the model must make a POS classification on the query token, and then perform some additional operation conditioned on that classification (copying specific token identities in a specific order). See Appendix A.5 for more details. See Figure 1 for an example.

We parameterize the task with vocabulary size  $v$ , the sampling distribution skew for nouns/adjectives  $\alpha$  (where we select  $\langle \text{noun} \rangle, \langle \text{ad} \rangle \sim \text{Zipf}(\alpha)$ ), and the ambiguity of token POS  $\varepsilon$ . The ambiguity parameter determines the percentage of tokens can act as both as noun and an adjective, and is inspired by the inherent ambiguity of POS in natural language. For our primary experiments, we fix  $\varepsilon = 0.10$ . Note, we find that  $\varepsilon$  must be greater than zero for an in-context solution to emerge at all. We compare our skewed distribution results to sampling tokens from a Uniform distribution.

In this task, an ICL solution to derive the POS of the query may achieve perfect accuracy by utilizing in-context information (e.g. a *copula* is always followed first by an adjective, then a noun). In contrast, an IWL solution to derive the POS of the query may achieve at most an accuracy of  $(1 - \varepsilon/2)$  due to ambiguous tokens. To account for this, we evaluate our models only on tokens that are not ambiguous; thus, both an ICL and IWL solution could achieve perfect accuracy. (Ambiguous tokens always use an ICL solution.)

Our task is formatted in a cloze-style where each token in the pattern is masked. We employ a MLM [Devlin et al., 2019] to predict the identities of these masked tokens, with hyperparameters described in Appendix A.6. Near-perfect validation accuracy is achieved after <60,000 steps on all experimental settings.

In addition to performance on a randomly selected validation set, we create datasets to evaluate the model’s preferred strategy throughout training, similar to Section 2. All examples in these datasets contain novel  $\langle \text{adj} \rangle, \langle \text{noun} \rangle$  pairs. Much like our naturalistic setting metrics in Section 2.1, we create Tail, Head, Head Switch, Tail Switch, and Unseen Token Accuracy metrics. In this setting, our head and tail metrics use the top and bottom 10% of the token distribution by count, respectively.

#### 3.1 Training Dynamics

**Structural ICL** We largely reproduce the results from the natural language setting presented in Section 2: structural in-context solutions emerge quickly, but are transient. This is shown by the




Figure 3: (Top) In-context performance by distribution with vanilla training; (Bottom) In-context performance by distribution with active forgetting. The parameters used are  $v = 10000$ ,  $\varepsilon = 0.10$ . Note that the Uniform distribution does not have a head or a tail, so its results are in the head graphs.

early peak of Unseen Token Accuracy, followed by its steep drop. This trend holds across all tested distributions in Figure 3 (Top Left). As such, both the syntactic and naturalistic settings align with our idealized graph of structural ICL transience exhibited in Figure 1 (Bottom Left). However, the disappearance of a structural in-context algorithm occurs extremely quickly compared to our MultiBERT experiments, likely due to the simplicity of our synthetic task.

**In-Context vs. In-Weights Strategies** In this section, we analyze whether models adopt conditional ICL or IWL strategies over the course of training. Our results are presented in Figure 3. Importantly, we find that increasing the skew of a distribution increases the pressure toward an IWL strategy. Conversely, examples with tokens drawn from a Uniform sampling distribution show a comparatively higher ICL preference (and thus lower IWL preference) than any Zipfian sampling distribution in Figure 3 (Top Middle). Among Zipfian skewed distributions, the model’s strategy varies based on whether the adjective and noun are in the head or the tail of the token distribution, much like in our naturalistic task. As in Section 2, we find that all skewed distributions prefer a IWL strategy for head tokens. However, for tail tokens, distributions of moderate skew ( $\alpha = 1.0001$ ,  $\alpha = 1.2$ ) prefer an ICL strategy as shown in Figure 3, while highly skewed distributions ( $\alpha = 1.5$ ) fail altogether as shown in Appendix A.7. This is likely due to the fact that these tokens are rarely observed in the training data. This illustrates an important distinction between structural ICL and conditional ICL – a structural ICL solution would maintain performance on the tail of highly skewed distributions. Additional experiments exploring the effect of ambiguity are located in Appendix A.8 and the effect of vocabulary size are located in Appendix A.9.

## 4 Maintaining Structural ICL with Active Forgetting

In Sections 2 and 3, we have demonstrated that as information gets memorized in the embeddings, the benefits of in-context information dissipate and models shift to an IWL strategy. In an effort to promote structural ICL, we utilize a recently-introduced training procedure: *active forgetting* [Chen et al., 2024]. When training a model using active forgetting, we re-initialize the embedding matrix every  $k$  steps during training. The intuition behind this is that the model *must* employ in-context strategies to achieve high accuracy, as no information can be preserved in each token’s embedding. In other words, the model can no longer assume that the input embeddings encode any particular information and thus must develop a structural ICL strategy. While after vanilla training, these unseen embeddings are out-of-distribution as illustrated in Figure 1 (Bottom Right), we hypothesize that




Figure 4: In-weights preference is coarsely controllable by varying temporary forgetting parameter  $N$ . All  $N > 0$  settings in figure induce success on completely abstracted generalization for all  $N$ . Note  $N = 0$  is vanilla training and  $N = \infty$  is active forgetting. Parameters used are  $v = 10000$ ,  $\varepsilon = 0.10$ ,  $\alpha = 1.5$ .

these unseen embeddings would align with seen embeddings after training with active forgetting. We explore this hypothesis in Section 6.

Training our models with active forgetting successfully engenders structural ICL, enabling the model to approach perfect performance on the Unseen Token Set (See Figure 3, Bottom Left). Given two random embeddings representing a noun and an adjective, the model can now (1) derive the POS of these tokens and (2) output the identity of these out-of-distribution embeddings in the desired pattern. Note that we see a slightly more stochastic version of our idealized trend from Figure 1 (Bottom Left) due to the resetting mechanism.

We test  $k = 100, 1000, 5000$  and settle on  $k = 1000$ , as this worked well in our preliminary exploration. With active forgetting, both the head and the tail of the training distribution prefer an asymptotic in-context strategy across all tested skews (See Figure 3, Bottom). Still, as the skew of the distribution of nouns and adjectives increases, there is greater pressure to memorize the head of the distribution (as these tokens are observed more frequently). Thus, it takes longer for the model to exhibit a preference towards in-context solutions for head tokens (e.g. almost 60,000 steps for the  $\alpha = 1.5$  setting) and there is a much larger drop-off in performance after every instance of forgetting the embedding matrix.

## 5 Dual Process Learning with Temporary Forgetting

While active learning successfully induces a structural ICL strategy, our model loses the ability to memorize information in its embeddings. This is detrimental in a variety of cases, such as when in-context information is insufficient to generate an appropriate response. An optimal model would encode a *dual process strategy*: maintaining a structural ICL solution while also memorizing useful linguistic properties [Chan et al., 2022b]. We modify the paradigm of active forgetting to attempt to induce a bias for structural in-context strategies in the tail of the distribution while preserving the in-weights solutions for frequently-observed tokens. We introduce **temporary forgetting**, where we perform active forgetting every  $k$  steps for the first  $N$  steps ( $N \gg k$ ) of training. After this point, we allow the embedding matrix to train as normal.

We find that by varying  $N$ , we can vary the model’s dependence on in-weights information on frequently seen tokens while maintaining structural ICL performance as displayed in Figure 4. If  $N$  is too large, this training procedure mimics the behavior of active forgetting, eliminating in-weights solutions in favor of structural in-context solutions. Additionally, if  $N$  is too small, the training only *sometimes* maintains structural ICL performance; note, however, that this seems to be an all-or-nothing effect. The sweet spot for  $N$  depends on the skew of the distribution. We show that in the  $\alpha = 1.5$  case, we can specifically control the preference for an in-weights strategy over an in-context strategy on observed tokens by modifying  $N$  (See Figure 4). In general, by manipulating the  $k$  we reset the embeddings and  $N$ , we can calibrate the relative strength of in-context vs. in-weights strategies.

Thus, temporary forgetting enables a model to successfully encode two distinct strategies for the same task. While this dual process strategy was previously demonstrated in Zipfian distributions with  $\alpha \approx 1.0$ , we can now induce this behavior for any distribution  $\alpha \geq 1.0$ , while also inducing structural ICL behavior on *all distributions* (See Figure 5).<sup>4</sup> Note that the control granted by temporary

<sup>4</sup>Distributions where  $\alpha \leq 1.0$  would likely only rely on an in-context strategy




Figure 5: (Left) Temporary forgetting achieves near perfect unseen token performance (structural in-context) asymptotically among distributions. (Right) In addition, temporary forgetting can asymptotically hold preference for an in-weights strategy in the head of the distribution while holding preference for an in-context strategy in the tail of the distribution (i.e. learn dual processes). Parameters used are  $v = 10000$ ,  $\varepsilon = 0.10$  and optimal hyperparameters  $k, N$  over gridsearch.

forgetting over head IWL preference has limits – we can push up to almost 90% the original IWL preference while maintaining a high tail ICL preference.

Temporary forgetting imparts an incentive that significantly enhances our ability to balance between in-context and in-weights strategies, overcoming inherent biases in naturally occurring data. By tuning the hyperparameters ( $k, N$ ), one can bias the model toward either type of solution.

## 6 Embedding Analysis

We perform qualitative analyses on the embeddings produced by vanilla training, active forgetting, and temporary forgetting in order to better understand how these training regimens impact model representations. These analyses, consisting of principal component analysis (PCA) and probing for POS, are located in Appendix A.10.

After vanilla training, the learned embeddings cluster according to their POS, far from the distribution of randomly-initialized tokens. We train a linear probe on these learned embeddings, and find that it can almost perfectly partition nouns and adjectives. Note that the disappearance of structural ICL occurs at the same time as the probe achieves above-random POS probing (i.e. memorization).

As expected, we do not see any structure in the embeddings produced after active forgetting. As such, a linear POS probe trained on these embeddings never achieves above random chance throughout training. The embedding distribution looks quite similar to the random initialization distribution, indicating that no information has been encoded in these embeddings.

Finally, the temporary forgetting setting reflects aspects of both vanilla training and active forgetting; that is, the head of the token distribution learns to partition nouns and adjectives whereas the tail of the distribution does not learn any structure. The tail embeddings much more closely resemble the initialization distribution with temporary forgetting than with vanilla training. This results in a unseen token generalization in addition to memorized information.

## 7 Related Work

**In Context v. In Weights** A body of recent literature closely examines in-weights versus in-context learning [Chan et al., 2022b,a, Reddy, 2023, Raparthy et al., 2023, Fu et al., 2024]. The emergence of in-context learning abilities in transformers has been shown to depend on the distributional properties of the training data such as burstiness, training class rarity, and dynamic meaning [Chan et al., 2022b, Reddy, 2023]. While we employ a similar analytical framework to this work, we (1) consider truly random heldout inputs and novel outputs/labels, (2) evaluate on large, natural language models, and (3) consider structural ICL. Additionally, while transience of in-context solutions has been noted in Singh et al. [2023], we find transience of structural ICL, and find that the adoption of conditional ICL actually *increases* over training for our synthetic setting. Additionally, unlike Singh et al. [2023], we find that increasing L2-regularization does not affect the transience of structural ICL in our synthetic setting (See Appendix A.7). Finally, we introduce temporary forgetting to solve what both Singh



et al. [2023] and Chan et al. [2022b] suggest to be an extremely useful behavior: the co-existence of in-context learning and in-weights learning.

More broadly, the conflict between context-dependent and context-independent (or reflexive) solutions has been well-studied in the cognitive and computational neuroscience literature [Russin et al., 2024, Rougier et al., 2005, Russin et al., 2022]. A key feature of human intelligence, termed *cognitive control*, is the ability to maintain dual strategies and flexibly deploy either one in response to particular stimulus. Any artificial system that aspires to producing human-like behavior must therefore be capable of maintaining both of these solutions.

**Weight Forgetting To Help Learn.** While most literature on *forgetting* characterizes this phenomenon as undesirable [Kemker et al., 2017, Kirkpatrick et al., 2017, McCloskey and Cohen, 1989, Ratcliff, 1990], recent neuroscience literature has shown that *intentional* forgetting may have positive roles in certain contexts [Srivastava et al., 2014, Pastötter et al., 2008, Levy et al., 2007, Anderson and Hulbert, 2021]. Intentional forgetting in neural networks is accomplished by resetting a subset of parameters during training. On computer vision tasks, this resetting procedure has been shown to help low compute and data resource generalization [Alabdulmohsin et al., 2021, Taha et al., 2021, Ramkumar et al., 2023]. Additionally, Zhou et al. [2022] show that a *forget-and-relearn* paradigm helps language emergence. Our method of forgetting embeddings is directly inspired by Chen et al. [2024], which shows forgetting during pretraining boosts linguistic plasticity for multilingual learning. As far as we know, we are the first to propose using forgetting to induce ICL.

## 8 Discussion

This research provides insights into the interplay between structural ICL, conditional ICL and IWL within transformers. We shed light on several critical factors determining how models manage and utilize the encoded and contextual information when faced with novel tokens and tasks.

**Structural In-Context Learning** One of our key findings is the transience of structural ICL in LMs. Initially, models exhibit a strong ability to leverage structural ICL, generalizing algorithms to unseen tokens. However, this capability disappears as training progresses, suggesting an initial inductive bias towards structural ICL that wanes as the model learns. This transience limits generalization on rare tokens and new tokens. We find that active forgetting maintains structural ICL by repeatedly reinitializing the embeddings. Our temporary forgetting training procedure enables a dual process strategy through strategic re-initialization of weights. This enables adaptability while still leveraging accumulated knowledge.

**Implications for Model Training and Application** Our findings are useful to design training protocols that result in flexible models. A significant reason for the success of LMs is their capacity for ICL and IWL strategies to co-exist, a behavior that organically occurs with a moderately skewed Zipfian distribution. However, most natural domains such as protein discovery, network traffic, and video recording face even more skew, breaking down this ideal behavior. Our temporary forgetting technique facilitates a dual process strategy regardless of skew, which could potentially bring some of the profound success of LMs to other domains.

**Future Directions and Limitations** The research opens up several avenues for future investigation. Future research should examine Structural ICL across different model architectures and configurations. One significant limitation is that our temporary forgetting experiments were not performed on LMs. Our compute resources limited such experiments, but we believe this is a critical future step to refining this training intervention. Another limitation of our work is that the optimal hyperparameters to temporary forgetting are not known a priori, and might require several runs to tune. Finally, another avenue of fruitful future research may be the translation of structural ICL algorithms into symbolic systems. As structural ICL does not rely on the content of the input, it should be possible to use techniques like circuit analysis [Räuker et al., 2023] to reverse-engineer an explicit symbolic representation of the algorithm that the neural network uses to solve a task.

**Conclusion** This study deepens our understanding of a model’s adoption of structural ICL, conditional ICL, and IWL strategy during training. The techniques introduced here not only enhance our theoretical understanding but also offer practical tools for improving model training and functionality in real-world applications.

## References

- Ibrahim Alabdulmohsin, Hartmut Maennel, and Daniel Keysers. The impact of reinitialization on generalization in convolutional neural networks, 2021.
- Michael C Anderson and Justin C Hulbert. Active forgetting: Adaptation of memory by prefrontal control. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 72(1):1–36, 2021. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-072720-094140. URL <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-072720-094140>.
- Nora Belrose, Quintin Pope, Lucia Quirke, Alex Mallen, and Xiaoli Fern. Neural networks learn statistics of increasing complexity, 2024.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. *CoRR*, abs/2005.14165, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.14165>.
- Stephanie C. Y. Chan, Ishita Dasgupta, Junkyung Kim, Dharshan Kumaran, Andrew K. Lampinen, and Felix Hill. Transformers generalize differently from information stored in context vs in weights, 2022a.
- Stephanie C. Y. Chan, Adam Santoro, Andrew K. Lampinen, Jane X. Wang, Aaditya Singh, Pierre H. Richemond, Jay McClelland, and Felix Hill. Data distributional properties drive emergent in-context learning in transformers, 2022b.
- Yihong Chen, Kelly Marchisio, Roberta Raileanu, David Ifeoluwa Adelani, Pontus Stenetorp, Sebastian Riedel, and Mikel Artetxe. Improving language plasticity via pretraining with active forgetting, 2024.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding, 2019.
- Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, Lei Li, and Zhifang Sui. A survey on in-context learning, 2023.
- Yanai Elazar, Shauli Ravfogel, Alon Jacovi, and Yoav Goldberg. When bert forgets how to POS: amnesic probing of linguistic properties and MLM predictions. *CoRR*, abs/2006.00995, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.00995>.
- Jingwen Fu, Tao Yang, Yuwang Wang, Yan Lu, and Nanning Zheng. How does representation impact in-context learning: An exploration on a synthetic task, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=JopVmAPyx6>.
- Shivam Garg, Dimitris Tsipras, Percy Liang, and Gregory Valiant. What can transformers learn in-context? a case study of simple function classes, 2023.
- John Hewitt and Christopher D. Manning. A structural probe for finding syntax in word representations. In Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4129–4138, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1419. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1419>.
- John Hewitt, Kawin Ethayarajh, Percy Liang, and Christopher Manning. Conditional probing: measuring usable information beyond a baseline. In Marie-Francine Moens, Xuanjing Huang, Lucia Specia, and Scott Wen-tau Yih, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1626–1639, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.122. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.122>.
- Daniel Kahneman. *Thinking, fast and slow*. macmillan, 2011.

- Ronald Kemker, Angelina Abitino, Marc McClure, and Christopher Kanan. Measuring catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *ArXiv*, abs/1708.02072, 2017. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:22910766>.
- James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A. Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, Demis Hassabis, Claudia Clopath, Dharshan Kumaran, and Raia Hadsell. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(13):3521–3526, March 2017. ISSN 1091-6490. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1611835114. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1611835114>.
- Sander Land and Max Bartolo. Fishing for magikarp: Automatically detecting under-trained tokens in large language models, 2024.
- Benjamin J. Levy, Nathan D. McVeigh, Alejandra Marful, and Michael C. Anderson. Inhibiting your native language: The role of retrieval-induced forgetting during second-language acquisition. *Psychological Science*, 18(1):29–34, 2007. ISSN 09567976, 14679280. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40064573>.
- Tomasz Limisiewicz and David Mareček. Syntax representation in word embeddings and neural networks – a survey, 2020.
- Linguistic Data Consortium. Ontonotes release 5.0. <https://catalog.ldc.upenn.edu/LDC2013T19>, 2013. Accessed on December 10, 2023.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization, 2019.
- Mitchell P. Marcus, Mary Ann Marcinkiewicz, and Beatrice Santorini. Building a large annotated corpus of english: The penn treebank. *Comput. Linguist.*, 19(2):313–330, jun 1993. ISSN 0891-2017.
- Michael McCloskey and Neal J. Cohen. Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem. In Gordon H. Bower, editor, *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, volume 24 of *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, pages 109–165. Academic Press, 1989. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-7421\(08\)60536-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-7421(08)60536-8). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0079742108605368>.
- Ryan McDonald, Joakim Nivre, Yvonne Quirnbach-Brundage, Yoav Goldberg, Dipanjan Das, Kuzman Ganchev, Keith Hall, Slav Petrov, Hao Zhang, Oscar Täckström, Claudia Bedini, Núria Bertomeu Castelló, and Jungmee Lee. Universal Dependency annotation for multilingual parsing. In Hinrich Schuetze, Pascale Fung, and Massimo Poesio, editors, *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 92–97, Sofia, Bulgaria, August 2013. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P13-2017>.
- Earl K Miller. The prefrontal cortex and cognitive control. *Nature reviews neuroscience*, 1(1):59–65, 2000.
- Liam Parker, Emre Onal, Anton Stengel, and Jake Intrater. Neural collapse in the intermediate hidden layers of classification neural networks, 2023.
- Bernhard Pastötter, Karl-Heinz Bäuml, and Simon Hanslmayr. Oscillatory brain activity before and after an internal context change - evidence for a reset of encoding processes. *NeuroImage*, 43: 173–81, 08 2008. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.07.005.
- Sameer Pradhan, Alessandro Moschitti, Nianwen Xue, Olga Uryupina, and Yuchen Zhang. CoNLL-2012 shared task: Modeling multilingual unrestricted coreference in OntoNotes. In Sameer Pradhan, Alessandro Moschitti, and Nianwen Xue, editors, *Joint Conference on EMNLP and CoNLL - Shared Task*, pages 1–40, Jeju Island, Korea, July 2012. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W12-4501>.
- Vijaya Raghavan T. Ramkumar, Elahe Arani, and Bahram Zonooz. Learn, unlearn and relearn: An online learning paradigm for deep neural networks, 2023.

- Akshay Rangamani, Marius Lindegaard, Tomer Galanti, and Tomaso A Poggio. Feature learning in deep classifiers through intermediate neural collapse. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett, editors, *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 28729–28745. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/rangamani23a.html>.
- Sharath Chandra Raparthi, Eric Hambro, Robert Kirk, Mikael Henaff, and Roberta Raileanu. Generalization to new sequential decision making tasks with in-context learning, 2023.
- Roger Ratcliff. Connectionist models of recognition memory: constraints imposed by learning and forgetting functions. *Psychological review*, 97 2:285–308, 1990. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:18556305>.
- Gautam Reddy. The mechanistic basis of data dependence and abrupt learning in an in-context classification task, 2023.
- Nicolas P Rougier, David C Noelle, Todd S Braver, Jonathan D Cohen, and Randall C O’Reilly. Prefrontal cortex and flexible cognitive control: Rules without symbols. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102(20):7338–7343, 2005.
- Jessica Rumbelow and Matthew Watkins. Solidgoldmagikarp (plus, prompt generation). *LessWrong*, 2023. URL <https://www.lesswrong.com/posts/aPeJE8bSo6rAFoLqg/solidgoldmagikarp-plus-prompt-generation>.
- Jacob Russin, Maryam Zolfaghar, Seongmin A Park, Erie Boorman, and Randall C O’Reilly. A neural network model of continual learning with cognitive control. In *CogSci... Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society. Cognitive Science Society (US). Conference*, volume 44, page 1064. NIH Public Access, 2022.
- Jacob Russin, Ellie Pavlick, and Michael J Frank. Human curriculum effects emerge with in-context learning in neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08674*, 2024.
- Tilman R  uker, Anson Ho, Stephen Casper, and Dylan Hadfield-Menell. Toward transparent ai: A survey on interpreting the inner structures of deep neural networks, 2023.
- Thibault Sellam, Steve Yadlowsky, Jason Wei, Naomi Saphra, Alexander D’Amour, Tal Linzen, Jasmijn Bastings, Iulia Turc, Jacob Eisenstein, Dipanjan Das, Ian Tenney, and Ellie Pavlick. The multiberts: BERT reproductions for robustness analysis. *CoRR*, abs/2106.16163, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.16163>.
- Aaditya K Singh, Stephanie C.Y. Chan, Ted Moskovitz, Erin Grant, Andrew M Saxe, and Felix Hill. The transient nature of emergent in-context learning in transformers. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=0f0GBzow8P>.
- Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Dropout: A simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(56):1929–1958, 2014. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v15/srivastava14a.html>.
- Ahmed Taha, Abhinav Shrivastava, and Larry Davis. Knowledge evolution in neural networks, 2021.
- Ian Tenney, Dipanjan Das, and Ellie Pavlick. BERT rediscovers the classical NLP pipeline. In Anna Korhonen, David Traum, and Llu  s M  rquez, editors, *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4593–4601, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P19-1452. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P19-1452>.
- Iulia Turc, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Well-read students learn better: On the importance of pre-training compact models, 2019.

Laurens van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. Visualizing data using t-sne. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9(86):2579–2605, 2008. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v9/vandermaaten08a.html>.

Hattie Zhou, Ankit Vani, Hugo Larochelle, and Aaron Courville. Fortuitous forgetting in connectionist networks, 2022.

Yukun Zhu, Ryan Kiros, Rich Zemel, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Raquel Urtasun, Antonio Torralba, and Sanja Fidler. Aligning books and movies: Towards story-like visual explanations by watching movies and reading books. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 19–27, 2015. doi: 10.1109/ICCV.2015.11.

## A Appendix / supplemental material

### A.1 Probing Setup

We provide probing background in this section, borrowing some notation from Elazar et al. [2020].

Given a set of labeled data of points  $X = x_1, \dots, x_n$  and task labels  $Y = y_1, \dots, y_n$ , we analyze a model  $f$  that predicts the labels  $Y$  from  $X$ :  $\hat{y}_i = f(x_i)$ . We assume that this model is composed of two parts: (1) an encoder  $h$  that transforms input  $x_i$  into a learned representation vector  $\mathbf{h}_{x_i}$  and (2) a classifier  $c$  that is used for predicting  $\hat{y}_i$  based on  $\mathbf{h}_{x_i}$ , such that  $\hat{y}_i = c(h(x_i))$ . We refer by *probe* to the classifier  $c$  and refer by *model* to the model from which the encoder  $h$  is a subset of.

Given this setup, we evaluate a particular model’s performance across various layers and training steps for our POS task. Each encoder  $h$  is associated with a specific training step and layer  $h^{t,l}$ . We probe the residual stream after layer  $l$ .

In this research, we are interested in the model’s choice of strategy at a particular time step. That is, we seek to describe the change in prediction of  $\hat{y}_i$  due to varying  $t, l$  of encoder  $h^{t,l}$ . Accordingly, we fix  $c$  as a single linear fully-connected layer.

### A.2 Structural ICL across Layers




Figure 6: We find that structural ICL is transient across all layers of MultiBERTs (seeds 0, 1, 2 averaged). The middle layers show the most structural ICL during early in training, whereas very early and very late layers remain about random throughout training.

We find that structural ICL consistently approaches random levels as training progresses across layers in the MultiBERTs. This signifies that the model fully loses the ability to process unseen tokens as training continues. This is likely the reason for the "glitch tokens" described in Land and Bartolo [2024], for which LMs fail to output sensible content.

### A.3 Pushdown Datasets

We use the train/dev splits from the English UD Treebank for the *c-pos*, *f-pos*, and *dep* tasks McDonald et al. [2013]; the train/dev splits from Ontonotes-v5 in the CoNLL-2012 Shared Task format for the *ner*, *phrase start*, and *phrase end* tasks Linguistic Data Consortium [2013], Pradhan et al. [2012]; the train/dev splits from Penn Treebank-3 for the *depth* and *dist* tasks Marcus et al. [1993]; and generated token sequences for the *prev*, *dup*, and *ind* tasks.

We reproduce baselines from Elazar et al. [2020] to verify the correctness of our probing setups for *c-pos*, *f-pos*, *ner*, *dep*, *phrase start* and *phrase end* and from Hewitt and Manning [2019] for *depth* and *dist*.

#### A.4 Pushdown Signature Observation in Syntax




Figure 7: The "Pushdown Phenomenon" is observed across syntactic features, suggesting that a transition from IC to IW strategies happens across these features. In early steps of training, representing syntactic information occurs in later layers, which are more contextualized. However, as training progress, the same properties are better encoded in earlier layers due to memorization of token-level and n-gram level information. The n-gram level information requires attention to build, which explains why performance in *dep*, *depth*, and *dist* does not propagate all the way to embeddings.

The "Pushdown Phenomenon" suggests that in early steps of training, computing token-wise syntactic properties occurs in later layers, which have more in-context information. However, as training progress, the same properties are better encoded in earlier layers until only the first couple layers are required for representing syntactic properties.

We examine whether the "Pushdown Phenomenon" exists in various syntactic properties in BERT. To do so, we employ our probing setup (Appendix A.1) for the tasks of named entity recognition (*ner*), coarse part of speech (*c-pos*), fine-grained part of speech (*f-pos*), dependency parsing (*dep*), syntactic constituency boundaries which indicate the start and end of a phrase (*phrase start*, *phrase end*), depth in the parse tree (*depth*), and distance in the parse tree (*dist*). We probe each property across the axes of (1) training time steps and (2) layers. We repeat this process for three seeds of the MultiBERTs [Sellam et al., 2021]. For all tasks, we probed all layers of MultiBERT seeds 0, 1, and 2 for timesteps from 0 to 200,000 increasing by 20,000; 200,000 to 1,000,000 increasing by 100,000; and 1,000,000 to 2,000,000 increasing by 200,000. If a specific word is composed of multiple subword tokens, we follow Hewitt and Manning [2019] and average the encoding across tokens.

We observe the "Pushdown Phenomenon" in all our examined tasks. However, we find that across tasks, syntactic information is "pushed down" at different rates. Early layer accuracy increases approximately follow a pattern of *ner* → *phrase start* → *cpos/fpos* → *phrase end* → *dep* → *depth* → *dist*. We leave it to future work to explore whether this timing is a function of (1) complexity of high-achieving rules/heuristics consistent with Belrose et al. [2024] or (2) a naturally occurring dependency hierarchy of syntactic relationships suggestive of implicit curriculum learning. One possible intuition for why the "Pushdown Signature" of memorization often coincides with poor maintenance of in-context strategies might be neural collapse [Parker et al., 2023, Rangamani et al., 2023], although this should be further investigated by future experimentation.

#### A.5 Synthetic Data Generation Formulation

Our synthetic data generation can be formally represented as a probabilistic context-sensitive grammar (PCSG). Mathematically, we parameterize our vanilla PCSG (without POS ambiguity) as follows:

$$\mathbf{G} = (N, \Sigma, P, S, \alpha, v)$$

where  $N = \{S, Q, Q_N, Q_A, P_N, P_A\}$  is the set of nonterminal symbols,  $\Sigma = \{N_{init}, A_{init}, N_r, A_r, C\}$  is the set of terminal symbols,  $S$  is the starting point (and notationally also represents sequence), and  $\alpha, v$  characterize the sampling probability distribution of our terminal symbols. Our production rules  $P$  are

$$F \rightarrow \begin{cases} S Q_N P_N \\ S Q_A P_A \end{cases} \quad \text{with eq. prob.}$$

$$\begin{aligned} S &\rightarrow \begin{cases} N_{init} C A_{init} \\ C A_{init} N_{init} \end{cases} & \text{with eq. prob.} & \quad Q &\rightarrow \begin{cases} Q_N \\ Q_A \end{cases} & \text{with eq. prob.} \\ Q_N &\rightarrow N_r & & Q_A &\rightarrow A_r \\ P_N &\rightarrow A_r A_r A_r & & P_A &\rightarrow A_r N_r N_r \end{aligned}$$

with terminal symbols sampled from

$$\begin{aligned} N_{init} &\sim \text{Zipf}\left(\alpha, 0, \frac{v}{2} - 1\right) & A_{init} &\sim \text{Zipf}\left(\alpha, \frac{v}{2}, v - 1\right) & C &\rightarrow v \\ N_r &\rightarrow N_{init} & A_r &\rightarrow A_{init} \end{aligned}$$

$N_{init}$  captures a specific token that corresponds to a token and all references to  $N_r$  use this token exactly, enforcing strict consistency.

Note our sampling distribution *Zipf* is a truncated Zipfian parameterized by the tuple  $(\alpha, s, e)$  with a probability mass function of

$$\mathbb{P}(X = k) = \frac{k^{-\alpha}}{H(\alpha, e - s)} \text{ for } k = s, s + 1, \dots, e, \text{ where } H(\alpha, n) = \sum_{k=1}^n k^{-\alpha}$$

We select tokens for  $\langle \text{noun} \rangle \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{v}{2} - 1\}$  and  $\langle \text{adj} \rangle \in \{\frac{v}{2}, \frac{v}{2} + 1, \dots, v - 1\}$ . Thus, given a particular vocabulary size  $v$  and Zipf parameter  $\alpha$ ,  $\langle \text{noun} \rangle \sim \text{Zipf}\left(\alpha, 0, \frac{v}{2} - 1\right)$  and  $\langle \text{adj} \rangle \sim \text{Zipf}\left(\alpha, \frac{v}{2}, v - 1\right)$ . To add further control to this setting, we introduce the parameter  $\varepsilon$  to describe ambiguity in the solution - that is, a proportion of  $\varepsilon$  tokens in each of  $n = 10$  bins grouped by probability mass do not have a fixed POS but instead may be a noun or adjective with equal likelihood.

Note that when  $\alpha = 0$ , this distribution degenerates into  $\text{Unif}(s, e)$  and when  $\varepsilon = 0$ , each token has a fixed identity.

## A.6 Toy Model

We employ a 6-layer BERT model across the synthetic setting experiments. Experiments were performed with an MLM as far less prior work has examined syntactic tasks with autoregressive models. Structure is much more difficult to intuit in autoregressive models as they are only exposed to an ordered subset of the tokens in a sentence. This model has 1 attention head per layer, 64-dimensional hidden dimensions, 128-dimensional intermediate representations, and tied weights for the embedding and unembedding layers. We optimize model parameters with AdamW with a learning rate of  $5 \times 10^{-5}$  [Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019]. We chose a thin and long representation to examine how representations evolve after each attention operation (for better granularity). The hidden dimension sizes were decided per a minimax strategy, i.e. this representation dimensionality was the smallest such that we achieved near perfect accuracy on a validation set for the downstream task. Future work should better examine the effect of representation size on in-context vs. in-weights learning.



## A.7 Performance by Token Decile




Figure 8: Increased weight decay has little/no effect on the failure of the structural ICL strategy (we increase weight decay from 0.01 to 0.1). In contrast, active temporary forgetting boosts rare token validation accuracy significantly, as seen in the tail of the distribution. Parameters are  $v = 10000$ ,  $\varepsilon = 0.10$ ,  $\alpha = 1.5$

We find that on highly skewed distributions, the tail of the distribution suffers immensely due to undertraining. This phenomenon cannot be rectified by Singh et al. [2023]’s method of promoting asymptotic ICL. However, we find that both active forgetting and temporary forgetting correct this behavior to boost performance on tail tokens in skewed distributions from near-zero to near-perfect levels.

## A.8 Ambiguity ( $\varepsilon$ ) Experiments




Figure 9: (Top)  $\varepsilon = 0.01$ , (Middle)  $\varepsilon = 0.10$ , (Bottom)  $\varepsilon = 0.50$ . Overall in-context strategy is dependent by amount of ambiguity in the labels. With 50% of the tokens as ambiguous, all unambiguous tokens use an in-context strategy; with 10%, there is a mixed strategy dependent on where in the distribution the example is; with 1%, almost unambiguous tokens use a memorized strategy. The vocab size is  $v = 10000$

In all of our ambiguity experiments, structural ICL is transient (even whe 50% of tokens are ambiguous). The ambiguity parameter significantly alters the models overall strategy. With a low ambiguity parameter, the model prefers memorization (IWL strategy) of unambiguous tokens and with a high ambiguity parameter, the model prefers an ICL strategy. Across all ambiguity parameters, there is a difference in tail and head behavior.

## A.9 Vocabulary Size ( $v$ ) Experiments




Figure 10: (Top)  $v = 1000$ , (Middle)  $v = 10000$ , (Bottom)  $v = 20000$ . The strength of an in-context solution depends on the interaction between vocabulary size  $v$  and skewedness of the distribution  $\alpha$ . Too small of a vocabulary size (i.e.  $v = 1000$ ) encourages more memorization in general but fixes performance in  $\alpha = 1.5$  setting. The ambiguity is  $\varepsilon = 0.10$ .

In all of our vocabulary experiments, structural ICL is transient. As expected, we find that vocabulary size has a similar effect to the skewedness of the distribution. That is, increasing the vocabulary without bound would lead to poor tail ICL performance. Too small of a vocabulary size seems to increase ICL among very skewed distributions but decrease ICL among all other distributions.

## A.10 Principle Component Analysis of Embeddings




Figure 11: Vanilla training imposes structure on the adjectives and nouns such that randomly initialized (unseen) tokens are out-of-distribution whereas active forgetting embeddings resemble the initial distribution. Parameters used are  $v = 10000$ ,  $\alpha = 1.0001$ ,  $\varepsilon = 0.10$ .

We find that while vanilla training results in embeddings that lie on a manifold, active forgetting results in embeddings that look similar to the initial distribution. This helps motivate our use of temporary forgetting as we would like to preserve embedding structure. Moreover, note that in the above figure we use  $\alpha = 1.0001$  and PCA whereas in Figure 1 (Bottom Right), we use  $\alpha = 1.5$  and T-SNE. The tail tokens in the higher skew distribution see fewer gradient updates and thus resemble the randomly initialized (unseen) tokens more (in addition to T-SNE likely being a better visualization tool).




Figure 12: Vanilla training learns to partition noun and adjective embeddings in the head of the distribution, and some structure in the tail. Active forgetting learns no separation between noun and adjective embeddings. Temporary forgetting learns structure in the head of the distribution and no structure in the tail of the distribution. Parameters used are  $v = 10000$ ,  $\alpha = 1.2$ ,  $\varepsilon = 0.10$ .

### A.11 Other Random Distribution Generalization

Note that while we define structural in-context learning as free from reliance on any *encoded semantic information*, it is important to note that this does not mean that structural in-context learning assumes *no* geometry of the space. In fact, this would be practically impossible to achieve because connectionist networks function in a geometric space and take advantage of orthogonality, translation, scaling, etc. If we cannot make assumptions about the distribution from which the data is sampled, then we deprive our networks of their toolbox. Still, we test on random sampling distributions for the embeddings other than our initialization distribution. Namely, we test on a uniform distribution from 0 to 1 and a large normal distribution with mean of 5 and standard deviation of 5.




Figure 13: Vanilla training fails on all random tokens, whereas active/temporary forgetting succeed on the random distribution of initialization. Active and stop forgetting do not generalize to arbitrary random distributions, although show some generalization to normal distributions with large means and variances.

### A.12 Required Compute for Experiments

We employed compute resources at a large academic institution. We scheduled jobs with SLURM. For our naturalistic experiments, each MultiBERT seed required 24 separate runs (one per tested checkpoint at a particular timestep), which totaled  $\approx 100$  hours on an RTX A5000 with 24 GB of GPU memory. Over 3 seeds, this was  $\approx 300$  hours of GPU usage. For our synthetic setting, the vanilla training required 64 separate runs (one per hyperparameter combination of vocab size, ambiguity, and sampling distribution), which totaled  $\approx 250$  hours of RTX A5000 usage. Likewise, our active forgetting and temporary forgetting interventions took a similar amount of GPU usage. Therefore, in total, our GPU usage for all synthetic experiments summed up to about 750 hours. We ran experiments mostly in parallel with SLURM to iterate quickly. Compute was a significant limitation for the development time and informed our development of training interventions in a synthetic setting. In total, our GPU usage was significantly higher than the reported number due to various failed/modified experiments. The total compute likely was around 20,000 GPU-hours on RTX A5000s, although this is a rough estimate.

## NeurIPS Paper Checklist

### 1. Claims

Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Yes, we show the paper's contributions claimed in the abstract/introduction empirically in Section 2, Section 3, Section 4, and Section 5. We provide accompanying qualitative explanations about structural in-context learning in Section 6.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
- The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A No or NA answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
- The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
- It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

### 2. Limitations

Question: Does the paper discuss the limitations of the work performed by the authors?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We discuss limitations of this work in Section 8 as well as briefly in Section 5. We also discuss limitations of the generalizability of structural in-context learning in Appendix A.11.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper has no limitation while the answer No means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.
- The authors are encouraged to create a separate "Limitations" section in their paper.
- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren't acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

### 3. Theory Assumptions and Proofs

Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: The paper does not include theoretical results.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
- All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
- All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
- The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
- Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
- Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

#### 4. Experimental Result Reproducibility

Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We describe training and test details for the naturalistic setting in Section 2.1 and Appendix A.1. We explain the data generation process and training/testing details for the synthetic setting in Section 3 and the model used in Appendix A.6. Additionally, we parameterize and clearly describe how to perform active forgetting in Section 4 as well as our introduced temporary forgetting in Section 5.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- If the paper includes experiments, a No answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.
- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general, releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
  - (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
  - (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
  - (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).



- (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

## 5. Open access to data and code

Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We release the code in the first footnote, which points to here. All datasets we use are open online through academic licenses or reproducible from our code.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
- Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so “No” is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
- The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.
- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).
- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

## 6. Experimental Setting/Details

Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer, etc.) necessary to understand the results?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We detail training and test details for the naturalistic setting in Section 2.1 and Appendix A.1. We detail the data generation process and training/testing details for the synthetic setting in Section 3, and Appendix A.6. Additionally, we show results for other possible hyperparameter selections in Appendix A.8 and Appendix A.9.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
- The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

## 7. Experiment Statistical Significance

Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We accompany naturalistic setting results with error bars from running over three seeds with closed form formula (See Figure 2). We do not have error bars over seeds for the synthetic results so not to crowd Figure 3 – we found very low variance based on initialization in our experiments. It is also evident that the main trends we find in this setting are significant and they hold over multiple sampling distributions.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The authors should answer "Yes" if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.
- The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).
- The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)
- The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).
- It should be clear whether the error bar is the conditional deviation or the conditional error of the mean.
- It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
- For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g. negative error rates).
- If error bars are reported in tables or plots, The authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

## 8. Experiments Compute Resources

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We discuss our utilized compute resources and how they informed our experimental design in Appendix A.12. We also disclose a rough estimate of our total compute here.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.
- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.
- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

## 9. Code Of Ethics

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics <https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines?>

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We follow the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer No, they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.

- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

## 10. Broader Impacts

Question: Does the paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Our research is not tied to particular applications and deployments. We simply introduce techniques that help generalizability and instill control in transformers. There is no societal impact of this work in itself, and no obvious direct path to negative applications that calls out.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.
- If the authors answer NA or No, they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.
- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.
- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to generate deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.
- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

## 11. Safeguards

Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pretrained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: This paper poses no such risks because we do not release models or release scraped datasets.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper poses no such risks.
- Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
- Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
- We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

## 12. Licenses for existing assets

Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We cite the MultiBERTs and Penn Treebank 3 Dataset used in Section 2 as well as a multitude of datasets used to observe the "Pushdown Signature" in Appendix A.3. These datasets were downloaded and licensed for non-commercial use (including research) by the Linguistic Data Consortium (LDC). We also cite the active forgetting code used in Section 4.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not use existing assets.
- The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
- The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
- The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.
- For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.
- If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, [paperswithcode.com/datasets](https://paperswithcode.com/datasets) has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.
- For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.
- If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset's creators.

### 13. New Assets

Question: Are new assets introduced in the paper well documented and is the documentation provided alongside the assets?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: The paper does not release new assets.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

### 14. Crowdsourcing and Research with Human Subjects

Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: The paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribution of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be included in the main paper.

- According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation, or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data collector.

15. **Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approvals or Equivalent for Research with Human Subjects**

Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or institution) were obtained?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: The paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent) may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you should clearly state this in the paper.
- We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the guidelines for their institution.
- For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.